

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                        | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/050,797                             | 01/18/2002  | Kazuichi Isaka       | 111697              | 9586             |
| 25944 7590                             | 10/18/2005  |                      | EXAM                | INER             |
| OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC                  |             |                      | NAFF, DAVID M       |                  |
| P.O. BOX 19928<br>ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320 |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| , Albanina in v                        |             |                      | 1651                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| ,  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| •  | 10/050,797  | ISAKA ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|  | David M. Naff   | 1651  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address   |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period way reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | N.<br>nely filed<br>the mailing date of this communication.<br>D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| <u> </u>   | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2005.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| ,  | ·   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E   | x parte Quayre, 1909 O.D. 11, 40  | 70 0.0. 210.  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  | •   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9,11,15,19 and 25</u> is/are pending in the application.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9,11,15,19 and 25</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o   | r election requirement.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine  | ır.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 January 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex  | •   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:   | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)   | )-(d) or (f).   |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| application from the International Bureau  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list   | of the certified copies not receive   | ed.   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) Interview Summary  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/29/05.</li> </ul>  | Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal F  6) Other:  | ate<br>Patent Application (PTO-152)   |  |  |  |  |

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

### DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/29/05 has been entered.

An amendment filed with the submission amended the specification, and canceled claims 10, 13, 17, 21, 23, 26 and 27.

Claims examined on the merits are 9, 11, 15, 19 and 25, which are all claims in the application.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 9, 11, 15, 19 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumino et al in view of Guttag (3,860,490).

The claims are drawn to a method of producing a microorganism-immobilized carrier for removing an exogenous endocrine-disrupting chemical in water by mixing microorganism with a hydrophilic prepolymer containing a hydrophilic group and a hydrophobic prepolymer containing a hydrophobic group in an amount of 1-40% of the total weight of hydrophilic and hydrophobic prepolymer, and polymerizing. Also claimed is the resultant microorganism-immobilized carrier

Art Unit: 1651

(claims 11), and methods (claims 15 and 19) of removing an exogenous endocrine-disrupting chemical in water.

Sumino et al disclose mixing a microorganism with an oligomer and polymerizing the oligomer to form a gel that inclusively entraps the microorganism (col 3, lines 17-20, col 5, lines 56-61 and col 8, line The gel containing the entrapped microorganism is used in decomposing endocrine disrupter related compounds (col 1, lines 54-60) such as bisphenol A (paragraph bridging cols 7 and 8, and col 8, lines The gel containing the microorganism is put in a reaction vessel (col 9, line 15 and col 10, line 31), and waste water 10 containing an endocrine disrupter related compound is contacted with the gel. The oligomer contains a main structure with polymeric double bonds at both ends, and a sub-structure arranged between the main structure and the polymeric double bonds containing a urethane bond and an ethyleneoxy, or a urethane bond and an ethyleneoxy and a 15 propyleneoxy (col 2, lines 16-23). The urethane bond has hydrophobicity and results in a gel that is flexible and has increased strength and erosion resistance (col 4, lines 37-43). The main structure is composed of a polyalkylene glycol that is a block copolymer formed by co-polymerizing a hydrophilic ethyleneoxy monomer 20 with a hydrophobic propyleneoxy monomer (col 4, lines 25-30). ratio of propyleneoxy is smaller than that of ethyleneoxy (col 4, lines 54-56). The ethyleneoxy has affinity for the microorganism (col 4, lines 15-17). Sumino et al also disclose a comparative example 25 (col 9, lines 60-64) using a conventional ethyleneoxy oligomer which

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

25

is a derivative of polyethylene glycol containing an acryloyl group or a metacryloyl group on each end.

Guttag disclose immobilizing a microorganism by polymerizing a mixture containing monomers and the microorganism (col 5, lines 50-60). Monomers present may be hydrophilic monomers (paragraph bridging cols 2 and 3) and monomers which are hydrophobic (col 3, lines 34-36) to produce a copolymer containing the microorganism entrapped therein.

When carrying out the comparative example of Sumino et al, it would have been obvious to co-polymerize the polyethylene glycol derivative which is hydrophilic with a polypropylene glycol derivative containing an acryloyl group or a metacryloyl group on each end which is hydrophobic to prevent the microorganism from decomposing a gel made of only the polyethylene glycol derivative as suggested by Sumino et al disclosing forming a block copolymer of hydrophilic ethyleneoxy and hydrophobic propyleneoxy to prevent the microorganism from decomposing the gel when only ethyleneoxy is present (col 4, lines 15-22), and as suggested by Guttag disclosing polymerizing a mixture containing a hydrophilic monomer, a hydrophobic monomer and a microorganism to produce a copolymer entrapping a microorganism. Omitting the urethane bond disclosed by Sumino et al would have been obvious for reasons set forth above. Since Sumino et al suggest that the amount of propylenoxy should be less than the amount of ethyleneoxy (col 4, lines 54-56), it would have been obvious to use an amount of hydrophobic pre-polymer within the range of claim 9. et al use the entrapped microorganism from the comparative example in

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

25

the same way as the entrapped microorganism from polymerizing the oligomer of the invention, and when carrying out the modification set forth above, it would have been obvious to use the entrapped microorganism to remove an exogenous endocrine-disrupting chemical from water as in present claims 15 and 19.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/29/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants have submitted a Statement Regarding Joint Research Agreement that was in effect before the date of Sumino et al, and urge that Sumino et al cannot be used as a reference. However, this statement is not in the form of a 131 Declaration signed by all of the inventors of the present invention. Moreover, the joint research agreement does not appear to establish priority of invention since the inventive entity of the Sumino et al is different from that of the present invention. A joint research agreement does not necessitate that all parties to the agreement are inventors. The priority application 18861 filed 1/26/01 cannot be used as evidence of prior invention since its date is after Sumino et al and it contains an inventive entity that is not the inventive entity of Sumino et al.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Naff whose telephone number is 571-272-0920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/050,797

Art Unit: 1651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 751-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dávid M. Naff Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651 Page 6

15 DMN

5

10

10/17/05